

apical area dull ochraceous; vertex about as long as breadth between eyes, subangularly produced in front, longitudinally centrally impressed; face with the disk moderately longitudinally smooth and flat, the lateral margins at regions of eyes distinctly transversely striate, a small central black spot at middle of its basal margin.

Long., incl. tegm., $7\frac{1}{2}$ mm.

Hab. Peru (Rosenberg, Brit. Mus.).

Allied to *K. ferrugatula*, Bredd.

GENUS SIGNORETIA.

Signoretia, Stål, Freg. Eug. Resa, p. 289 (1858).

Type, *S. malaya*, Stål.

Signoretia pacifica.

Tettigonia pacifica, Walk. List Hom., Suppl. p. 357 (1858).

Hab. West Africa.

Specimens purchased by the British Museum as "Breddin's Co-types," of which no description can be traced.

Tettigonia histicula, Bredd.

— *nubicula*, Bredd.

— *musividula*, Bredd.

— *atrogantula*, Bredd.

— *auromicantula*, Bredd.

— *illuminatula*, Bredd.

— *offuscabula*, Bredd.

— *complutula*, Bredd.

— *luctula*, Bredd.

— *jocicula*, Bredd.

Tettigonia plebejula, Bredd.

— *olivatula*, Bredd.

— *ludicula*, Bredd.

— *limbatula*, Bredd.

Oncometopia asperula, Bredd.

— *venasuta*, Bredd.

— *linialifrons*, Bredd.

— *lividula*, Bredd.

Amblydisca incarnatula, Bredd.

[To be continued.]

PROCEEDINGS OF LEARNED SOCIETIES.

GEOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

March 4th, 1908.—Prof. W. J. Sollas, Sc.D., LL.D., F.R.S.,
President, in the Chair.

The following communication was read:—

‘On *Metriorhynchus brachyrhynchus*, Deslong., from the Oxford Clay near Peterborough.’ By E. Thurlow Leeds, B.A.

This species was first described by E. E. Deslongchamps in 1868, and was based on an imperfect skull, obtained from the department of Calvados, Lower Normandy. He was led to distinguish it

from other species by the shortness of its snout. He mentions one other mutilated skull found near Poitiers, and there is a third in the Muséum de la Faculté des Sciences at Caen. Two skulls have recently been obtained by Mr. A. N. Leeds, F.G.S., from the Saurian zone of the Lower Oxford Clay, in the neighbourhood of Dogsthorpe, Peterborough. No other parts of the skeleton were found with them, even the mandibles being missing. The two specimens belong to the same species, and after comparison with descriptions, figures, and photographs of the specimens above mentioned, they have been referred to *Metriorhynchus brachyrhynchus*. This is believed to be the first recorded occurrence of the species in England; and the specimens help to throw additional light on the cranial osteology of the species, especially in the parts which are wanting in the type-specimen. They are, therefore, described in order to amplify Deslongchamps's description. The skulls are neither of them perfect, but one fortunately supplements the other, and both are perfect in one of the most interesting parts—the frontal region and the part from the nasals to the premaxillæ. The specimens are compared and contrasted throughout with *M. superciliosus*. It is found that these specimens possess the main characteristics determining Deslongchamps's species, although the prefrontals, which are in keeping with the general massive development of the skull, are wider than he supposed; and it is possible to reconstruct with almost absolute certainty the region of the posterior nares, showing the bifurcated opening with the vomerine element running back almost to the sphenoid, a feature which the Author thinks will prove to be common to all species of *Metriorhynchus*.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The Type of Cidaris.

To the Editors of the 'Annals and Magazine of Natural History.'

GENTLEMEN,—May I have space for a word in reply to Dr. Bather's article in the March 'Annals' concerning the type of *Cidaris*? He maintains that the type can and should be selected by the rule of "type by tautonymy"; but this seems to me simply impossible. Linné's species *cidaris* is a composite, equivalent undoubtedly to Leske's composite, *papillata*, but not by any means equivalent to *papillata* s. str. Indeed, there is no evidence that Linné ever saw *papillata* s. str., for there is no specimen of that cidaroid among the Linnean Echini, and Lovén simply assumed that Linné had seen it. I do not object to accepting *E. cidaris*, L., or *C. papillata*, Leske, as the type of *Cidaris*, simply because it will upset *Dorocidaris* (the motive Dr. Bather attributes to me), but because neither of those species is identifiable.